

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

Job No. 22192
Written Response Required: NO
Due Date: N/A
Actionee: N/A
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: GW/VZ100
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 8830/4170

CCN: 067406

SUBJECT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING – MARCH 15, 1999

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, GW/VZ Project Manager

DATE March 25, 1999

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

NOTE: The date of the next scheduled meeting has been changed to April 12 due to Spring Break. The decision is detailed in these minutes.

Date: Monday, April 12, 1999
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on March 15, 1999 in Richland, Washington at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Assembly Room.

PROJECT REPORT:

REGULATORY PATH FORWARD WORK GROUP (Bruce Ford):

The Regulatory Path Forward Work Group met last Thursday. The meeting occurred at the same time that the Hanford Advisory Board Environmental Restoration (HAB-ER) Committee meeting was also taking place. We think that had something to do with the sparse attendance. The focus of the group was two-fold. First, the group developed a Draft Charter (attached), and secondly we discussed the immediate steps we want to take.

The first line of the charter reads “the Regulatory Path Forward Work Group identifies and details the regulatory requirements that apply to key Hanford Site cleanup decisions and develops options that integrate the regulatory framework into a single, consistent approach.” What we talked about was the first phase; laying out the regulatory requirements and framework and defining key issues. To help pull that together, Tom Wintczak has drafted a planning sheet laying those out. He gave a copy of it to the work group and requested a quick turn-around on comments. With those comments, we’ll fill in the matrix as best we can and present the revised version at the next Regulatory Path Forward Work Group meeting.

QUESTION: Did that planning sheet go out to everybody? What was it?

ANSWER: It detailed regulatory issues and requirements in the 100 Area, as well as selected waste site groupings in the 200 Area. It was passed out to the members of the Regulatory Path Forward Work Group, and Tom also distributed some copies to the members of the HAB-ER Committee. (To obtain a copy, please contact Tom Wintczak at 509-372-9105.)

COMMENT: That work group is very small compared to the other work groups associated with the Project. We'd really like a broader participation. Anyone is welcome to attend.

QUESTION: Are you holding two meetings a month?

ANSWER: We are planning to assess where we are in next week's meeting, and then we will decide if we should hold the meetings once per month or every other week.

QUESTION: Is the goal of this group to establish points of compliance?

ANSWER: That is one of the things we'd like to work on. In order to do it "officially," it would have to be incorporated into the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA). This group could lay out recommendations from a Department of Energy (DOE)/regulatory perspective. To use it as a regulatory driver, it has been discussed incorporating it into the TPA as an added chapter. That's down the road a bit though.

QUESTION: There have been concerns expressed about how this all relates to the System Assessment Capability (SAC). Will those portions outside of regulatory issues be handled through the SAC Work Group? How does that relate to regulatory issues?

ANSWER: The SAC would, by necessity, have to encompass all of the regulatory requirements, but the SAC should also address the issues and concerns raised by the members of the stakeholder community. There are many common elements between the regulator and stakeholder views, but there are also some disconnects. The SAC Work Group will take both sets of requirements into account when designing the SAC.

QUESTION: This is not necessarily a constraint?

ANSWER: No.

COMMENT: As influential and comprehensive as the TPA is, there are still issues that apply here that go a couple of steps beyond the regulations.

SAC WORK GROUP (Bob Bryce):

We had previously set a tentative date of March 17 for the next SAC Work Group meeting. However, in order for the group to progress, there are things that need to be addressed prior to the meeting. As a result, we scrapped the plans for having a meeting on that date, and the members of the SAC Work Group were notified.

We are currently working on a SAC re-plan within the Project to secure funding and establish scope for the rest of this fiscal year (FY99). We are also in the process of preparing the minutes from the meetings on

February 24 and March 3 for distribution. The candidate set criteria comments will be distributed as part of the February 24 minutes. We'll get those out to people so we can keep moving forward.

The next SAC Work Group meeting is scheduled for April 29. We plan to meet with interested people on specific technical elements of the SAC between now and then.

QUESTION: Can we go back to the regulatory pathway? Once you finalize those items, and you look at the tasks for this and next year, how do they fit in the regulatory path forward? There will be documents to come out of the SAC, such as the design specification. Does that become an assessment deliverable or could it fall under the regulatory pathway as a prime document? If it doesn't fit in with the regulatory framework, what is the plan at that point to get the document out and codified with everybody? Do we create our own process?

ANSWER: It sounds to me like part of the issue is whether the GW/VZ Integration Project has a TPA framework to work within. I don't see that being an issue for the Regulatory Work Group. If it is a higher level policy issue that is between DOE-Richland (RL) and the regulators, then it should be handled by the Policy Work Group. It needs to be determined if the review process is within TPA criteria, or if it needs to be modeled on other tools that are TPA driven. We can't go too far before answering the basic question of "where does it all fit?" If you put out a design specification, it needs a process.

COMMENT: The SAC is nowhere near that stage yet. I think that the Policy Work Group should handle this to decide how this all fits into the big picture. The SAC is way behind so far as I know.

RESPONSE: We may not be ready to release anything yet, but we do need to define the process and plan for it.

COMMENT: It should be discussed in the Regulatory Work Group before it goes to the Policy Work Group. They can try to address it there and see how far they can get. If they can handle it, then that might be the right place to do it. If it turns out to be a larger issue than they can handle, then ship it over to the Policy Work Group.

COMMENT: This definitely doesn't belong in the SAC Work Group though. In the last SAC meeting the focus should have been on uncertainty, but things kept returning to policy issues. You work on scope as it applies to a deliverable, but a process needs to be defined in relation to the deliverable. We should get help from the other groups on this one.

RESPONSE: How do you start that process? This is something that was brought up during the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) Corrective Action negotiations as well. It definitely would be useful to have a meeting on this. The Policy Work Group might be a possible place to define the process, but when is the appropriate time to decide this? This needs to be worked on an open basis. We need to define what documents to make available for public review. We need to be thinking about how to get the people from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) more involved in the discussion. I assume that the Environmental Assurance and Permitting (EAP) division of DOE-RL has drafted something that would apply to this. I think the TPA has served as a good framework, and people are used to that kind of format. We should probably stick to that framework. If we don't, then we need to create our own process, and that could be ugly and time consuming.

POLICY WORK GROUP (Dru Butler):

We have decided to hold Policy meetings only once per month in order to allow people more time to participate in the other work groups. We will continue supporting the needs of the other groups. There are currently no issues from those groups before the Policy group, but we'll jump in when called upon. There are some open issues, such as treaty rights. Stan Sobczyk is working on a white paper for that issue. The next scheduled meeting for the Policy Work Group is for the first week in April, but we may change that because of Spring Break. That will be discussed later in this meeting. (NOTE: New date is April 12.)

QUESTION: How do the three work groups fit in with upcoming work like the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Facility Investigation/ Corrective Measures Study (RFI/CMS) Workplan for the tank farms? One of the things to do is assess the need for interim corrective actions relative to what Environmental Restoration (ER) might be doing. Is the planned assessment done with the assumption of industrial end use or what? Does determining this fall to the Regulatory or Policy Work Group?

COMMENT: The Policy Work Group provides feedback, not binding decisions. The main advantage of the Policy Work Group is the ability to discuss issues without a lot of the complications of a full blown negotiating session.

QUESTION: I've got a similar question pertaining to issues related to decision making. Some of the decisions will be regulatory related. There are some decisions relating to integrating management on the DOE side with the contractors so that everyone is working together efficiently. Also, there are assessment issue concerns that go beyond regulatory decision making. Who is making those decisions? Are those kinds of things the domain of the Policy or Regulatory Work Group? It sounds like a little of both. I'm just wondering what to expect in the decision realm.

ANSWER: Assessment items fall in the realm of the SAC Work Group. The Regulatory Work Group is a subset of the types of issues coming from the SAC. That's one of the reasons that the Regulatory Work Group was formed. The SAC Work Group had some questions that needed to be addressed.

QUESTION: Isn't coordinating the 200 Area part of the Regulatory Work Group?

ANSWER: Yes, that's one other thing to look at. Another is scheduling of characterization in the 200 Area. We'd like to better link regulatory work with TWRS work. That's something we haven't hit real hard yet.

TWRS WORK PLAN UPDATE (Carolyn Haass/David Olson):

Last week we completed the Data Quality Objective (DQO) for preliminary field activities for this summer. In the DQO, we discussed information from RCRA wells, what kind of data we expect from decommissioning borehole 49-09-39, and what new activities are planned this summer. For the RCRA wells, we agreed that there would be one well near SX. We agreed on sixteen different locations to take samples from in the decommissioning of 49-09-39. We decided on drilling a vertical borehole southwest of SX-108. We haven't agreed on a specific location. We need to get back with Ecology on that.

QUESTION: Who was involved?

ANSWER: There were representatives from Ecology, DOE, the various site contractors, and the Tribes. EPA was invited, but they didn't show. Site experts for specific issues also participated.

QUESTION: Who was there from the SAC Team?

ANSWER: Tony Knepp was there from the GW/VZ Project. Terri Stewart and John Zachara were involved too.

QUESTION: Shouldn't there have been more involvement from the SAC?

ANSWER: The SAC is still at a very high level, and this was preliminary planning, so not really.

QUESTION: Shouldn't the SAC Work Group be telling you what to do?

ANSWER: Not when talking about one specific borehole.

COMMENT: The opinion of the SAC Group at this point is that any data is good data.

QUESTION: When will you be in a position of integration where the SAC knows what their needs are and can tell you what they would like you to do?

ANSWER: That's still downstream somewhere. It's not in the very near future. There are some SAC people involved in the process, and for now that fits our needs.

COMMENT: A few individual boreholes are not going to make that big a difference with the SAC, but they will make a difference with conceptual models and the like.

COMMENT: We're in the process of integrating from a TWRS perspective, but some issues like data gathering will impact the SAC.

A new work group kicked off yesterday working on the RFI/CMS. It is still a part of the DQO process. It will follow the same schedule that the previous DQO meetings dealing with the S/SX preliminary work plan were following, but it's a different group of people. This process is programmatic rather than technical in nature. The goal is understanding the objectives and data needs of the TWRS program and what is needed to help resolve specific issues.

QUESTION: Who is involved in this process?

ANSWER: The people involved include the Tribes, DOE, Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL), Ecology, EPA, and the people owning the specific programs within Lockheed Martin.

EXPERT PANEL SUB PANELS (Virginia Rohay):

Next week, there will be two sub-panels of the GW/VZ Expert Panel meeting here in Richland. The first is the Field Investigations and Data Gathering Sub-Panel chaired by Dr. John Matuszek. They will be meeting on Monday and Tuesday, March 22 and 23.. Their focus will be the preliminary S/SX waste program described earlier. They will review what has been done to this point and provide feedback.

QUESTION: Are these meetings open?

ANSWER: Both days will be totally open except for a closed work session requested by the four panel members on Tuesday to allow them to confer and come to a preliminary consensus. However, following that closed session they will speak in an open session from 4 to 5 p.m. to discuss their preliminary opinions and comments.

QUESTION: Who are the members of the sub-panel?

ANSWER: The four members are Dr. Matuszek, Ralph Patt, Dr. Peter Wierenga, and Dr. John Conaway.

On Wednesday March 24, the Peer Review sub-panel will convene. At present the panel consists of only one person, Dr. Conaway. Currently there is no draft agenda prepared. The goal is to look at the peer review planned for various GW/VZ processes. Both sub-panels will be meeting here at BHI. The Data Gathering Sub-Panel will be in the Assembly Room and the Peer Review Sub-Panel will be in 1B40.

The full GW/VZ Expert Panel next meets on May 13-15. That is a Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. The location of the meeting is yet to be determined. We had planned on holding the meeting in the BHI Assembly Room, but there is a conflict on May 13 with the HAB-ER Committee. We are trying to work around that. We do not know yet whether we will have to change locations for just the one day, or if we will find other arrangements for all three days.

QUESTION: The HAB-ER Committee has met in BHI Room 2D-01 in the past when conflicts arose. Is that a possibility?

ANSWER: We've approached the HAB-ER about that, but they didn't want to move. We've considered the possibility of combining part of the meetings for part of the day. We floated that idea out there at the last HAB meeting, and they seemed interested in that possibility.

QUESTION: What is the one thing that you want out of the two sub-panels? Is it just to review the DQO workplan?

ANSWER: The workplan won't be ready, but the Data Gathering Sub-Panel will be looking at the stuff proposed during the DQO process for the wells, etc. We will also discuss the overall picture, where we're headed, and get feedback from the sub-panel on our path. We'll show them a 3-D visualization that MACTEC has produced and discuss how we can use it as a tool to put all the data together and be able to make hypotheses. The focus of the meeting is on constructive feedback and getting a blessing on the field work proposed this summer.

The Peer Review Sub-Panel is something that was initiated by the Expert Panel themselves. They wanted to get background and information on the peer review processes of the GW/VZ Project and core projects. These meetings were framed as a dialogue with the individual projects on what they are doing and on what they plan to do as the GW/VZ Integration Project evolves.

QUESTION: Who has the lead for preparing the agenda for the Peer Review Sub-Panel?

ANSWER: Virginia Rohay is working with Dr. Conaway to draft the agenda.

QUESTION: Do you already have people lined up to attend?

ANSWER: Dr. Conaway has laid out what he'd like to talk about, and we're working on getting people committed to time slots.

COMMENT: If what he is looking for is reports from various projects, then this seems better suited to three or four half-hour segments rather than a formal meeting.

RESPONSE: He's not as interested in what is already in place. He'd rather discuss what we envision for the future and what kind of peer review we plan for those things.

COMMENT: There are other issues that should be addressed, such as problems that we've had in the past with various peer review processes. If that's not planned, then it should be added. For example, there was the Groundwater Modeling Peer Review Panel. Things like short notice for the meetings, lack of interaction with the GW/VZ Integration Project, etc. were problems. You should include a "lessons learned" kind of thing.

COMMENT: The core projects have done quite a bit with peer review. There was peer review involved for the Retrieval Performance Evaluation (RPE) as well.

COMMENT: The problem is that if we dive too far into what we've done in the past, then forward thinking suffers.

COMMENT: Dr. Conaway envisions a series of short meetings with various people or groups where they just sit around the table and discuss certain issues. He would like to keep things as informal as possible.

COMMENT: From looking at the calendar, there might be another problem with the Expert Panel meetings in May. The Washington Advisory Group (WAG) will be here at the same time as the Expert Panel. The WAG will be here for the entire week. That makes getting out a preliminary agenda for May a priority.

QUESTION: Is the DQO for the S/SX preliminary plan finished?

ANSWER: Yes.

QUESTION: Will there be a write-up provided to the panel before they get here?

ANSWER: We'll be using presentation materials and walking them through our logic and reasoning. We're not going to be able to get anything to them before hand.

COMMENT: There have been discussions in the past about making sure the panel is up to speed prior to meetings. It sounds like you are going to attempt to go through the entire DQO process all over again in the meeting. If it were me, I'd want to make sure I was up to speed on the boreholes you're talking about prior to the meeting.

ANSWER: They are up to speed on those. The sub-panel consists of four of the five members of the old SX Expert Panel.

QUESTION: How does this effect the TPA milestone involved?

ANSWER: Admittedly, we are running on a tight timeline for the milestone. If the sub-panel comes in and totally invalidates what we've done, then obviously it would be devastating. We're fairly confident that won't happen though. We're going into this with the view that this is the best we have. If they point us in a totally different direction, then we run the risk of missing the milestone, and that would be an undesirable outcome, but we're optimistic.

HAB-ER COMMITTEE MEETING (Dru Butler):

This was a different HAB-ER meeting than usual. Instead of having contractors or DOE-RL come in and give presentations, they decided to talk among themselves for a good portion of the meeting. We told them where we are on the SAC. They also took input from the Columbia River Comprehensive Impact Assessment (CRCIA) group into account. The HAB-ER Committee is in the process of doing their own long-range plan. They are looking at points of compliance and endstates. They are looking at many of the same near-term things that we are. Overall it was a good meeting. People were proactive about moving ahead.

MEETING SCHEDULES (Dru Butler):

A couple of people have suggested that this GW/VZ Open Meeting go to a monthly schedule instead of bi-monthly. We have been placing a time demand on a lot of people with the DQO meetings and the various work groups. There are pros and cons of going to one meeting a month. One of the downs is that it will be more difficult to keep everyone current. We have been using this meeting, and the minutes that are produced from it, as a way to keep everyone informed. There are other ways to update people without a meeting, but that seems like a downside.

QUESTION: Would you hold the Policy Work Group meeting the same day?

ANSWER: That would be the plan. We would hold both meetings on the first Monday of the month.

COMMENT: I'm not sure that the Regulatory and Policy Work Groups are outlined in great enough detail yet. It wouldn't be in the best interest of the Project to cut down on the general Project meeting until the sub-teams are defined a little better.

RESPONSE: We talked about this in house today, and I (Michael Graham) am not real comfortable with going to once a month at this point. I think these other groups aren't well established enough yet. A couple of times a month seems to be working with the many issues and things that we're doing. I think we should stay with twice a month for the time being.

COMMENT: Also, with these groups putting out charters, and the SAC group defining its schedule, it becomes difficult to justify cutting down on the larger group at this point. You need to have the larger group continue to meet in order to steer the other smaller teams if needed. Maybe after they have their scope a little better defined, then the larger group won't be as critical to keeping everything on course. Until that time, we should stick to the two meetings a month.

RESPONSE: That's settled. Until the other groups are a little more formalized, we'll continue to meet bi-monthly. We'll keep it on the table though and talk about it a couple of meetings from now because of the time concerns people have expressed.

COMMENT: There is one more issue. The next scheduled meeting (April 5) occurs during Spring Break for most schools in the Tri-Cities. Some people will not be able to attend due to vacations planned with their families. I'd like to propose changing the meeting to following Monday (April 12).

RESPONSE: There doesn't appear to be any objection. Let's go ahead and change the next Open Project Meeting to Monday, April 12.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

(Fred Mann) This week the mobilized waste program is putting out a couple of documents for public review. They are "Performance Objectives for the Hanford Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) Performance Assessment" and "Scenarios for the Hanford ILAW Performance Assessment." I am giving Gary Jewell (509-372-9192) fifty copies of the documents to give out to anyone requesting a copy. Also, I will make sure that he gets an electronic version of the documents to post on the GW/VZ Project website.

UPCOMING EVENTS:

(See attached Look Ahead Calendar)

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments please contact Dru Butler (509-375-4669), Gary Jewell (509-372-9192), or Karen Strickland (509-372-9236)

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1) Regulatory Path Forward Work Group Draft Charter
- 2) 6-Week Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Marty Bensky, Tri-Cities Caucus
Marcel Bergeron, PNNL
Bob Bryce, PNNL
Dru Butler, BHI
Don Clark, JAI Corp.
Bruce Ford, BHI
Dib Goswami, Ecology
Michael Graham, BHI
Carolyn Haass, LMHC
Mary Harmon, DOE-HQ
Dave Holland, Ecology
Rich Holten, DOE-RL

Michael Hughes, BHI
Bob Lober, DOE-RL
Katy Makeig, SMS
Fred Mann, FDNW
David Olson, DOE-RL
Wade Riggsbee, YIN
Gordon Rogers, HAB
Virginia Rohay, BHI
Ron Skinnarland, Ecology
Stan Sobczyk, NPT
Rob Yasek, DOE-RL

ATTACHMENT 1

**Draft Charter
Regulatory Path Forward Work Group**

The Regulatory Path Forward Work Group identifies and details the regulatory requirements that apply to key Hanford Site cleanup decisions and develops options that integrate the regulatory framework into a single, consistent approach. These options will be provided to DOE and regulatory agency decision makers. The working group does not have the authority to establish policy.

ATTACHMENT 2

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
MARCH 22, 1999 – MAY 27, 1999
TWO MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

March 22-23	GW/VZ Expert Panel – TWRS-SX Sub-Panel (Richland)
March 24	GW/VZ Expert Panel – Peer Review Process Sub-Panel (Richland)
March 24	TPA Public Involvement Quarterly Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn – 1-3 p.m.)
March 25	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 25-26	Hanford Advisory Board Meeting (Richland – Tower Inn)
March 30	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
March 30-31	Oregon Hanford Waste Board Meeting (Ontario, OR) (GW/VZ on agenda for 3/31)
March 30 – April 1	Hanford 100N Area ITRD Meeting (BHI Assembly Room)
April 1	DQO Meetings - SST RFI/CMS Workplan (BHI Room 1B40 – 8 a.m. to Noon)
April 1	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
April 8	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
April 12	GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)
April 12	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
April 15	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)
April 19	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)
April 19-21	Environmental Toxicology & Risk Assessment-Environmental Fate and Transport Symposium, ASTM (Seattle)
April 22	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
April 29	System Assessment Capability Workshop (BHI Assembly Room – 8 a.m.-4 p.m.)
April 29	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
May 3	GW/VZ Policy Work Group Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.)
May 3	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 1-3 p.m.)

May 4-6	TechCon/ITRD Forum on Reducing Surface Infiltration Around the Hanford Tanks (Cavanaugh's, Kennewick) Contact: Rob Yasek
May 6	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
May 13	HAB-ER Committee Meeting (BHI Assembly Room – 9 a.m.-4 p.m.)
May 13-15	GW/VZ Expert Panel meetings (Richland, WA - Location to be Determined)
May 17	GW/VZ Open Project Team Meeting (Richland – BHI Assembly Room – 1 p.m.)
May 20	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)
May 27	Regulatory Path Forward Meetings (BHI Room 1B40 – 1-2:00 p.m.)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS

April 1	Proposed TPA Change Package for SST Groundwater and Vadose Zone Characterization public comment period ends
April 30	Performance Objectives for the Hanford Immobilized Low-Activity Waste (ILAW) Performance Assessment and Scenarios for the Hanford ILAW Performance Assessment public comment period ends